

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

ANTONIO HARRIS,

Plaintiff,

OPINION AND ORDER

v.

13-cv-883-wmc

DANE ESSER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Antonio Harris filed this civil action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that prison officials at the Wisconsin Secure Program Facility were deliberately indifferent to his medical needs and used excessive force against him by using incapacitating chemical agents to extract him from his cell. In an order dated January 8, 2015, the court granted Harris leave to proceed with a claim for relief against several defendants. That order has been returned “undeliverable,” reflecting that plaintiff has been released from custody. He has not provided the court with an updated address.

It is not the obligation of either this court or the clerk’s office to search for litigants. Rather, it is the litigant’s responsibility to advise the court of any change to his or her contact information. *See Casimir v. Sunrise Fin., Inc.*, 299 F. App’x 591, 593, 2008 WL 4922422 (7th Cir. 2008) (affirming the denial of a Rule 60(b) motion where movants claimed they did not receive notice of summary judgment due to a house fire, adding that “all litigants, including pro se litigants, are responsible for maintaining

communication with the court”); *see also Soliman v. Johanns*, 412 F.3d 920, 922 (8th Cir. 2005) (“[A] litigant who invokes the processes of the federal courts is responsible for maintaining communication with the court during the pendency of his lawsuit.”). The plaintiff has clearly failed to provide the court with an accurate, current address. Because plaintiff has failed to provide a current address, it appears that he has abandoned his complaint.

Accordingly, under the inherent power necessarily vested in a court to manage its own docket, the complaint will be dismissed without prejudice for want of prosecution. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b); *Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962); *Ohio River Co. v. Carrillo*, 754 F.2d 236, 238 n.5 (7th Cir. 1984).

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the complaint filed by plaintiff Antonio Harris is DISMISSED without prejudice for want of prosecution. Plaintiff is advised that relief from this order may be granted upon a showing of good cause.

Entered this 27th day of January, 2015.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

WILLIAM M. CONLEY
District Judge